



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# ADVOCATE OF PEACE.

~~~~~  
MAY AND JUNE, 1847.  
~~~~~

## SPECIFICS FOR PEACE.

THE object of Peace is simple and well-defined,—the entire abolition of the custom of War, or the prevalence of Peace among all nations as their permanent policy; but it is amusing to observe what a variety of means different classes of men prescribe as either indispensable, or best adapted to secure this end, and betray, in these specifics, their respective peculiarities of temperament, education and general reasoning. To few, if any, of these specifics, considered in themselves and their place, would we object; but we protest against insisting upon any one of them to the *exclusion* or undervaluing of all the rest.

One of these classes tell us to rely on the gospel. That alone, say they, can ever do the work; and hence the only or the most efficacious co-workers in this cause, are pastors and churches at home, and missionaries abroad, the Bible, Tract, and kindred Societies, seeking to bring men every where under the power of the gospel. Here are the true peace societies, such alone as God will ever crown with complete success for the world's pacification.

Now, there is much truth in this; and the chief error lies in the assumption that the gospel can ever abolish war, or any other great evil, without a direct, specific application to the case. It is indeed God's chosen remedy for the world's moral maladies; but, like all other remedies, it must be rightly applied before it can effect a cure; and the whole aim of the peace movement is merely to secure such an application of the gospel to war. How else can it ever abolish this custom? By such influences as it has been exerting? Why, the gospel has been for fifteen centuries preached after a sort to nations reputedly Christian, and still is Christendom not only bleaching with the bones of millions slaughtered in this

very century, but bristling at this hour with three millions of bayonets ready for mutual butchery!

Another class, not very different from the foregoing, bid us make all men Christians, as the only way to peace among nations. It is pretty certain, however, that men must be converted to a higher kind of Christianity than that which has so long permitted its votaries to plunder, and shoot, and stab one another by millions, and then return solemn thanks to their common God and Redeemer for success in such deeds of mutual vengeance. If men were converted to the *whole* gospel, to its pacific as well as its other truths and duties, to such views and habits as made the early disciples refuse to fight, simply because they were Christians, they would of course abstain from war; or, if all mankind were brought *fully* under the general influences of Christianity without any very specific application to peace, we should expect to see wars cease ere long from the whole earth. But must our hopes of peace wait for such a result? Must *all* men be actually converted to God, and reach a high degree of Christian perfection, before nations can be persuaded to abstain from war?

Christian philanthropists have not been wont to reason thus on kindred topics. They did not wait for *all* to be converted, before they urged men to give up the intoxicating bowl, and sought the abolition of the slave-trade and slavery; nor can we see any better reason why they should delay specific, associated efforts in the cause of peace, until all or even more men are converted to God, or the mass of Christians reach any higher degrees of holiness.

Others bid us wait for Christianity to accomplish our object as one of its general, incidental results. Such men generally care too little for peace to reason about it as they do upon kindred subjects. Who ever dreamed of waiting for the general influences of the gospel, without any specific application or effort for the purpose, to do away intemperance, or duelling, or the slave-trade? True, we rely upon the influences of Christianity for the abolition of war; but it is only upon these influences directly applied in the ways urged by the friends of peace.

Some, however, go to the opposite extreme of insisting that men must embrace *radical* views of peace before war can ever be made to cease. Radicalism is their nostrum, a sort of moral panacea. You must coincide pretty exactly with their views, or you are just no peace-man at all! They regard the belief of war inconsistent with Christianity as indispensable to the abolition of this custom, and all lower views as of little or no avail. Channing, the Ameri-

can Erasmus of our cause, was never a real friend of peace; nor can we regard even Worcester and Ladd, though so long the champions of peace, as much else than virtual abettors of war, until they came, after the lapse of five or ten years, to embrace the doctrine of all war unchristian!—a doctrine which served only to make them *better* peace-men. Just as if there were no *other* arguments for the abolition of this custom, or as if a man could oppose it for only *one* type of reasons! Others deem a belief in the strict inviolability of human life essential, and tell us we must oppose *all* taking of human life, or we shall not, when it comes to the test, condemn any war. Just as if a man must believe *all* use of alcohol wrong, before he can be made to discard entirely the use of it as a beverage; or as if we must denounce all death-penalties, before we can oppose duelling, assassination or piracy! Strange logic; and yet some of those who use it, deem themselves the simon-pures of peace, its only reliable friends.

Still another class out-simon Simon himself, and tell us we must discard all penalties, all force, all government, before we can reach settled, permanent peace! ‘The evil,’ say they, ‘lies in government itself. It claims the right of brute force, the power of life and death, for the accomplishment of its purposes. Here is the root of all war; and, so long as you retain civil government, you never can get rid of this custom.’ Here we reach the nadir of radicalism, the Ultima Thule of ultraism. We have actually met it in this precise form, and been explicitly told we must annihilate all human government before we can abolish war!—Of these last views, so “*ultra beyond ultra*,” as Mr. Ladd used to describe them, we shall take no further account in considering the specifics for peace. We simply mention here the fact of their existence in “sporadic cases,” and wish not to be considered as including them in any of our subsequent references to the variety of expedients urged for the abolition of war.

Now, if such extreme views are *essential*, in what year of the world is this custom to be abolished? If we must wait for the conversion of *all* men, or a majority of them, to the unlawfulness of all war, or the strict inviolability of human life, how long will it take to sweep war from the earth, or from Christendom alone? These strong views are much more prevalent in England and the United States than any where else; but among their fifty millions, scarce one in a thousand, certainly not one in a hundred, believes either of these doctrines, and indefinite centuries must elapse before we can hope to see them all, or any decisive majority of them,

embracing such radical views. They might, with comparative ease, be persuaded to discard war on *other* grounds, and vast multitudes are ready to do so now; but we are considering the theory which requires the adoption of these extreme views as *indispensable* to peace.

Let us see how any one of the sticklers for this theory would himself act when put to the test. Let him circulate a petition for peace; and will he ask none but radicals of his own stamp to sign it? Let him go before Parliament or Congress to influence the very men who are to decide the question of peace or war; and what arguments will he use with them? Will he dwell *exclusively* on the abstract wickedness of war, on the utter unlawfulness of all violent self-defence, on the strict inviolability of human life? Perhaps not one man in Congress or Parliament believes or respects either of these doctrines. Will he then waste his breath in urging what they all discard and despise? Will he not rather present such views as they can and will appreciate? There are arguments enough of this kind; and on these every man of sense would, in such a case, mainly dwell. But, if he would act thus with rulers, why not with the people? Why not, in each case alike, adopt the easiest, surest, shortest way to gain your object, a decisive verdict of mankind against the practice of nations settling their disputes by the sword?

Others still would leave all such discussions, and push at once to practical substitutes for war, such as stipulated arbitration, or a congress of nations. Substitutes of this sort we *have* urged from the first; and we shall continue to do so, until nations come to adjust their difficulties, as individuals now do theirs, by *some* mode of amicable agreement between themselves, or of voluntary reference to umpires. But how can we best persuade them to adopt substitutes like these as their common, permanent policy? They must see more clearly, and feel more deeply the guilt and evils of war, before they will begin to inquire in earnest for any method whatever of superseding its alleged necessity. Here is the starting-point of our labors; and here we must plant the main-spring or the lever of our whole enterprise, and expect the adoption of peaceful substitutes for war only from a general demand of the people, from a change of public opinion, that shall require a corresponding change in the international policy of Christendom.

Here, then, comes another catholicism—the doctrine of Universal Brotherhood. I like the general idea very much, as one familiar to my mind, and dear to my heart; one that teems with high relations, and world-wide influences for good; one that I have long cherished

and advocated as an auxiliary to peace ; one, too, that will bear, like pure gold, to be hammered out, till it covers the whole surface of our common humanity. All this, and a great deal more, I can honestly say in its favor ; but as a practical measure, or a system of instrumentalities for the promotion of peace, or any other single object, I hardly know what it means. It is a fine conception, but altogether too vague and broad for any specific purpose. It covers every thing in general, but fixes necessarily on nothing in particular. It is no more adapted to war than it is to famine or the slave-trade, and might as properly erect itself into a Bible or a Missionary Society, as into one for Peace. It is one of those vague, magnificent generalities, which for a time enrapture persons of a sanguine, excitable temperament. I am glad to see it used as an argument for peace, and think it may be made for a time very useful in its way. Still, as a distinct enterprise, or a set of operations for the good of mankind, I should not know what to make of it. It may mean any one of twenty things, or all of them together ;—peace, or temperance, or anti-slavery, or free-trade, and I know not how many other things designed for the general good, for the welfare of the Universal Brotherhood, or any portion of them.

Such are some of the specifics for peace ; and, so far from opposing or undervaluing any of them, we go for them all in their place, and merely insist that no one shall be allowed to exclude the rest. All are in some sense right, and each important in its sphere ; and fain would we leave the way open for all that will, to urge each his favorite arguments and expedients for peace. There is room for them all, and need of them all. Then let those who think the gospel, in its general principles, a remedy for all evils, just apply it to this specific evil ; let those who would first make men Christians, bring as many as possible to a pure Christianity ; let those who are strenuous for the most radical doctrines of peace,—I do myself believe all war contrary to the gospel,—convert as many as they can to their principles ; let those who are most affected with the guilt or the evils of war, impress their own views upon all they can reach ; let those who are most intent on practical substitutes for war, explain and enforce such substitutes to the utmost extent of their power ; and, finally, let those who are delighted with the grand idea of universal brotherhood, turn this conception over and over in the kaleidoscope of their fancy, until they are dizzy with the dazzling splendors it shall pour upon their ravished vision. Give every one free scope, and let him, in his own favorite way, as best for himself, do what he can and will for peace. Lay every body

and every thing under contribution to this blessed cause, and *concentrate all possible influences for such a change of opinion and feeling on the subject, as shall lead civilized, Christian nations to adopt some expedient for superseding the sword forever*, and leaving their myriads to learn war no more.

#### SOME ITEMS MORE ABOUT THE MEXICAN WAR.

WE have in our last numbers given pretty full specimens of this nefarious war; but we cannot refrain from chronicling a few more.

**MORE ABOUT VOLUNTEERS ON THEIR WAY TO THE WAR.**—"Our stay in New Orleans," says one of the men, as quoted in the Philadelphia North American, "has been a very disagreeable one, owing to the conduct of some outlaws, 'the Killers,' in Capt. Hill's company. By these acts, our regiment became the terror of every one. They entered the houses, turned out the owners and their families, and attempted indignities upon the females. On the evening of the 11th, they entered the house of a Frenchman, and broke into the chamber of his daughter, when he fired, and shot two of them. Captain Hill came up with a detachment of fifty men, and took the rest to prison. The evening before we left New Orleans, they entered his tent, and attempted to murder him; but the guard fortunately came up and rescued him. The next day he threw up his commission, and left for Washington. This state of things must now cease, as we are about entering the enemy's country, where martial law will be strictly enforced, and those who mutiny, will be instantly shot."

**MORE OUTRAGES IN NEW ORLEANS.**—"On Friday evening," says the N. O. Courier, Jan. 1847, "one of the volunteers fired a pistol ball at the conductor of the Mexican rail-cars, which came near giving him a fatal wound. Some of the volunteers had taken possession, according to their custom, of two or three of the cars, answering the demand for payment with a pistol ball, as we have stated.

On Saturday, a more dismal affair took place. About half past 6 o'clock in the evening of that day, several volunteers went to the cabaret and grocery of Mr. Claude Martin, within the parish of St. Bernard, near the line of that of New Orleans. Martin, who is upward of 50 years of age, was behind his counter, and asked them if they wanted any thing. On their saying no, he commenced passing into an adjacent room, where his wife lay sick; but he was struck with a pistol ball, and fell to the ground shot through the heart. There were three or four negroes present, who declared that the man who fired the shot instantly fled."

**OUTRAGES AGAINST WOMEN IN MEXICO.**—These we should expect, especially in war, from such men as were scooped up from the grog-shops, brothels and other dirty holes of our cities; but we hardly anticipated, from men on the spot, so frank and free a disclosure of their villainies in this respect as is given in the following extract from a letter dated "Ceralvo, Jan. 4th, 1847." "I must," says the writer, "devote one paragraph to a subject that I have too long neglected to allude to, and one that has given me great pain during my whole stay in Mexico; I mean the disreputable conduct of some of the volunteer troops. Below Mier, we met the 2d Regiment of Indiana troops, commanded, I believe, by Col. Drake. They encamped near our camp, and a portion of them were exceedingly irregular in their behavior, firing away their cartridges, and persecuting the Mexican families at a *ranchero* near by. They were on their return from near Mon-